UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Λ

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/665,241	09/18/2000	Eric M. Silberstein	IDIK-001; 55692-012	4412

23550   7590 .   12/01/2005

HOFFMAN WARNICK & D'ALESSANDRO, LLC
75 STATE STREET
14TH FL
ALBANY, NY 12207

EXAMINER
MANIWANG, JOSEPH R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2144	

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 September 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>26-50</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>26-50</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)   Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20051115

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   Claims 26, 27, 30, 34, 35, 38, 41, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by Challenger et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,216,212), hereinafter referred to

as Challenger.

3.   Regarding claims 26, 38, and 42, Challenger disclosed a method and system

comprising managing an abstraction layer that organizes data for a plurality of content

objects (see column 8, lines 3-10), each of which comprises one of a plurality of

resource types (see column 10, lines 17-20), wherein the abstraction layer defines a

unique path for locating the data for each of the plurality of content objects regardless of

the corresponding resource type and a corresponding file system used to store each

content object (see column 14, lines 58-63); managing a set of object links that

interfaces with the abstraction layer, wherein each object link comprises a source

content object for a source website, a target content object for a destination website

different from the source website, and one of a plurality of object link types (see column

8, lines 30-42); receiving a modification of data for the source content object (see

column 8, lines 36-40); obtaining an object link for the source content object from the

set of object links (see column 8, lines 40-42); determining the target content object

based on the object link (see column 8, lines 40-42); and updating data for the target content object based on the modified data for the source content object and the object link type for the object link (see column 9, lines 18-28).

4.   Regarding claim 27, Challenger disclosed the method and system including ensuring that a resource type for the source content object and a resource type for the target content object are the same (see column 8, lines 51-65); and copying the data from the source content object to the target content object based on the resource type (see column 8, lines 51-65).

5.   Regarding claim 30, Challenger disclosed the method and system further comprising obtaining a second object link from the set of object links for the target content object; determining a second target content object based on the second object link; and updating data for the second target content object based on the updated data for the target content object and an object link type for the second object link (see column 8, line 66 through column 9, line 7).

6.   Regarding claim 34, Challenger disclosed the method and system further comprising generating the object link for the source content object (see column 7, lines 38-51).

7.   Regarding claims 35 and 41, Challenger disclosed the method and system further comprising generating the target content object based on the source content object and the object link, wherein the target content object inherits at least one property from the source content object (see column 9, lines 18-28).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. Claims 28, 29, 31-33, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Challenger et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,216,212), hereinafter referred to as

Challenger, and further in view of Lakritz (U.S. Pat. No. 6,623,529).

9. Challenger disclosed a method and system comprising managing an abstraction

layer that organizes data for a plurality of content objects (see column 8, lines 3-10),

each of which comprises one of a plurality of resource types (see column 10, lines 17-

20), wherein the abstraction layer defines a unique path for locating the data for each of

the plurality of content objects regardless of the corresponding resource type and a

corresponding file system used to store each content object (see column 14, lines 58-

63); managing a set of object links that interfaces with the abstraction layer, wherein

each object link comprises a source content object for a source website, a target

content object for a destination website different from the source website, and one of a

plurality of object link types (see column 8, lines 30-42); receiving a modification of data

for the source content object (see column 8, lines 36-40); obtaining an object link for the

source content object from the set of object links (see column 8, lines 40-42);

determining the target content object based on the object link (see column 8, lines 40-

42); and updating data for the target content object based on the modified data for the

source content object and the object link type for the object link (see column 9, lines 18-

28).

10. While Challenger disclosed updating data for the target content object based on

the modified data for the source content object and the object link type for the object

link, Challenger did not specifically disclose an object link type comprising a translate

link for performing a workflow to translate source data into a different language for the

target content object.

11.   In a related art of web content delivery, Lakritz disclosed a method and system

comprising a source and target object (see column 2, lines 38-43) translated into

another language through a translation link (see column 9, lines 44-47) using a workflow

(see column 4, lines 64-67; column 9, line 51; column 11, lines 17-23). Lakritz further

disclosed sending a notification of a required translation to a user (see column 2, lines

32-34; column 6, lines 3-6) and receiving confirmation that the required translation step

has been completed (see column 9, lines 44-57; column 10, lines 5-10).

12.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine the teachings of Challenger and Lakritz to provide a system for

translating a source content object into another language for a target content object as

claimed. The invention of Challenger generally provided a way to modify a target object

through a link to a source object. Lakritz further disclosed using such links as a way to

translate the source object into another language. One of ordinary skill in the art would

have been motivated to consider incorporating the teachings of Lakritz as they provided

a more compact, efficient, and easy way to provide document localization (see column

5, lines 19-33).

13.   Claims 36, 37, 39, 40, and 45-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Challenger et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,216,212), hereinafter referred to as

Challenger, and further in view of Lakritz (U.S. Pat. No. 6,623,529).

14.   Challenger disclosed a method and system comprising managing an abstraction

layer that organizes data for a plurality of content objects (see column 8, lines 3-10),

each of which comprises one of a plurality of resource types (see column 10, lines 17-

20), wherein the abstraction layer defines a unique path for locating the data for each of

the plurality of content objects regardless of the corresponding resource type and a

corresponding file system used to store each content object (see column 14, lines 58-

63); managing a set of object links that interfaces with the abstraction layer, wherein

each object link comprises a source content object for a source website, a target

content object for a destination website different from the source website, and one of a

plurality of object link types (see column 8, lines 30-42); receiving a modification of data

for the source content object (see column 8, lines 36-40); obtaining an object link for the

source content object from the set of object links (see column 8, lines 40-42);

determining the target content object based on the object link (see column 8, lines 40-

42); and updating data for the target content object based on the modified data for the

source content object and the object link type for the object link (see column 9, lines 18-

28).

15.   While Challenger disclosed managing a set of object links that interfaces with the

abstraction layer, Challenger did not specifically disclose the use of project links.

16.   In a related art of web content delivery, Lakritz disclosed a method and system

for translating a source content object into another language for a target content object,

the translation of several objects handled by project links (see column 10, lines 40-65).

17.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine the teachings of Challenger and Lakritz to provide a system for

updating website content comprising managing a set of projects and project links. One

of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to consider incorporating the

teachings of Lakritz as they provided a more compact, efficient, and easy way to

provide document localization (see column 5, lines 19-33). The invention of Lakritz also

provided fully automated management of the translation process, thus removing much

of the burden placed on users of the system (see column 13, lines 1-5).

Response to Arguments

18.   Applicant's arguments filed 09/02/05 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

19.   Regarding claims 38-50 previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being

directed to non-statutory subject matter, the rejections have been withdrawn.

20.   Regarding claims 26-27, 30, 34-35, and 41-42 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

as being anticipated by Challenger (U.S. Pat. No. 6,216,212), Applicant asserts that the

reference does not teach the limitations of newly amended claims 26, 38. Specifically,

regarding claim 26, Applicant asserts that Challenger does not teach an abstraction

layer that organizes data for content objects and defines a unique path for locating the

data for each of the content objects regardless of a corresponding resource type and a

corresponding file system used to store each content object. Examiner submits that

Challenger teaches an abstraction layer that clearly defines a unique path for locating

data for each of the plurality of content objects, as Challenger disclosed an object

dependence graph defining unique dependencies between objects and their associated

data (see column 6, lines 40-56; column 15, lines 3-10). Applicant further asserts that

Challenger is unrelated to managing an update of website content between a source

content object and a target content object for two different websites. Examiner submits

that Challenger clearly taught updating a target content object with a source content

object of a different website, as the reference was directed towards "constructing and

maintaining objects to associate changes in remote data with cached objects" (see

column 2, lines 58-65), the sources comprising web pages on a remove server and the

target comprising a caching server (see column 3, lines 30-35; see column 7, lines 26-

37; column 8, lines 30-43).

21.   Regarding claims 36-37, 39-40, and 45-50 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Challenger in view of Lakritz (U.S. Pat. No. 6,623,529),

Applicant asserts that the references do not teach the claimed limitations. Specifically,

regarding claim 45, Applicant asserts that the references fail to disclose anything

resembling the claimed project link, which defines an update relationship between a

source project and a target project and comprises one of a plurality of project link types.

However, Examiner submits that Lakritz disclosed such a functionality as claimed where

it was disclosed that job tickets and work packets defined the update tasks to be

performed between a source of documents and a set of target completed documents on a web site for a project (see column 10, line 40 through column 11, line 13).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph R. Maniwang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3928. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JM

DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100